

III. Remarks

A. Claim Objection

The Action objects to claim 1, stating that “the sensor” in line 4 should be “a sensor.” Reconsideration of this objection is respectfully requested. Claim 1 recites “a voltage drop circuit coupled to an input terminal of the sensor.” “The sensor” refers back to “A sensor” recited in claim 1 and “the sensor” recited in line 3. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

B. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

The Action rejects various claims for reciting a “voltage divider.” Throughout the claims, this recitation has been amended to “voltage drop circuit.” Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

C. Rejection based on Dungan et al.

The Action rejects claims 1-10 and 13-21 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,311,391 to Dungan et al. Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of canceled claims 9-11 and claim 13 has been amended to include the features of canceled claim 22. It is submitted that the rejection of these claims is now moot.

D. Rejection based on Lien et al.

The Action rejects claims 1, 13, 14, 23-28 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,069,782 to Lien et al. As mentioned above, Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of canceled claims 9-11 and claim 13 has been amended to include the features of canceled claim 22. Claim 25 has been amended in the same manner as claim 13. It is submitted that the rejection of these claims is now moot.

E. Rejection based on Lien et al. and Smith et al.

The Action rejects claims 11 and 22 as being obvious from Lien et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,112 to Smith et al.

It is submitted that the Examiner has not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least claim 11. Therefore, the finality of this Action should be withdrawn. With

respect to claim 11, the Examiner argues that Lien discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 but does not disclose the cascaded transistor as claimed. The features of claims 9-11 have been amended into claim 1. Claim 11 as pending before this Action depended from claim 10, which depended from claim 9, which depended from claim 1. Claim 11 did not depend directly from claim 1. Claims 9 and 10 are not rejected in the Action in view of Lien et al. Therefore, it is submitted that the Action does not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the finality of this Action should be withdrawn.

Claim 13 has been amended to include the features of canceled claim 22. Claim 13 also recites further that the cascaded NMOS comprises “at least two NMOS transistors having common gate, source and drain terminals.” FIGS. 3 and 4 of Smith et al. do not teach cascaded NMOS transistors having common gate terminals. It is submitted, therefore, that claim 13 and its dependent claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

In view of the foregoing arguments and amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to that effect is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any excess payment that may be associated with this communication to deposit account **04-1679**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/18/07


Joseph A. Powers, Reg. No.: 47,006
Attorney For Applicants

DUANE MORRIS LLP
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-4196
(215) 979-1842 (Telephone)
(215) 979-1020 (Fax)